

From: Benjamin Sherman
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:20 PM
Subject: Preserve Diversity and Media Ownership Limits - DO NOT Remove Remaining Regulatory Limits on Corporations

Benjamin Sherman
40 Pearl St.
New Bedford, MA 02740

May 4, 2003

FCC Commissioner Michael Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street., SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Commissioner Copps:

The FCC must NOT further weaken the rules that help preserve competition and diversity among the owners of American media.

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

The FCC is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal of or further modification to these rules will likely open the door to more mergers that will continue to reduce competition and diversity in the media. If the rules are weakened further, one company in a city could control the most popular newspaper, TV station and possibly the cable system, giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of news and information. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in this country. Media ownership would be concentrated by corporate monopolies even further, and the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with diverse viewpoints would be compromised.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge, our ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

I think it is important for the FCC to not only consider the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is incumbent on the Commission to take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Sherman

From: Dale Hall
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:20 PM
Subject: FCC Biennial Regulatory Review 2002

Hello,

I am concerned that the variety of news reported is already much limited by the high level of consolidation. I believe that the current regulations should be strengthened not dismantled. My understanding is that the FCC charter is to further competition in the interest of the American public. Please do not reduce the regulation to enable a few large organizations to control the news media.

Thank you,
Dale Hall

The new MSN 8: smart spam protection and 2 months FREE*

From: Michael Howard
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:31 PM
Subject: Fw: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a know track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protection that, for decades, have helped to ensure a health political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Michael Howard
Rogers, Arkansas

From: Michael Howard
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:36 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Mr. Copps,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a know track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protection that, for decades, have helped to ensure a health political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Michael Howard
Rogers, Arkansas

From: bob van
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:43 PM
Subject: Cross-ownership

May 4, 2003

Michael J. Copps, Commissioner, FCC

Dear Commissioner,

Below find a copy of a letter I recently sent to Chairman Michael K Powell expressing my views concerning the cross-ownership of radio, television and printed media. I feel strongly this is not in the best interests of the general public. I would appreciate your help in not allowing cross-ownership to take place.

Sincerely,

R.E. Van Velkinburgh, 2081 West Craig Lane, Syracuse, Utah 84075

E-Mail address bjvan@prodigy.net

Michael F Powell Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Powell,

I read with a great deal of interest a copy of your remarks at the Associated Press Annual Meeting and General Session of the National Newspaper Association Annual Convention on April 28, 2003. I agree that over the years technology has made many changes in our communications industry making regulation more and more difficult.

You stated that cross-ownership involving radio and television stations and the printed media could allow for more efficient production and expand programming. This may be true but is it the responsibility of the FCC to help increase the bottom line of communication corporations? I see a real danger in cross-ownership. This would make it possible for one corporation to own and control all the radio stations, all the television stations, and all the newspapers in a given community. While "efficiencies" could be gained the result would be a single viewpoint on news and events coverage. Daily programming on radio and television would reflect management choices. How could this possibly be in the public interest?

So far as expanding programming is concerned, it is well known that a monopoly is not prone to try any new innovations but instead tries to maintain the status quo.

It is for these reasons that at your up-coming meeting June 2, 2003 I respectfully ask you not to allow cross-ownership to be made legal.

Sincerely,
R.E. Van Velkinburgh
2081 West Craig Lane
Syracuse, Utah 84075

From: Ka55free@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:44 PM
Subject: Media de-regulation

It is not in the best interest of the people of the United States to further de-regulate their media. A vote on June 2 to not eliminate the ban on media cross-ownership and ease other ownership regulations will aid more opinions being expressed in the media and informing the public.

Thank you.
KA McCarty
1114 SE Bel-Aire Road
Ankeny, IA

From: Carleton Spotts
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:50 PM
Subject: revision of media ownership rules

112 times in the Communications Act, Congress used the term "public interest." I am the public; you are the public, my neighbor is the public; CORPORATIONS ARE NOT THE PUBLIC. It is contrary to the obvious intention of Congress and it is contrary to the continuation of our representative democracy to allow small numbers of large corporations to control the media. I am particularly concerned with its news function which already has become monolithic. Please don't expand this policy and thereby create less variety in news coverage. Thank you.

From: Rcb339@cs.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:56 PM
Subject: Media Ownership

Dear Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

May 3, 20003

It has come to my attention that on June 2, 2003 sweeping reforms are going to occur which will affect media ownership in the U.S., thus allowing for greater consolidation of broadcasting outlets. I am writing to ask you not to support legislation which would allow increased monopolization of the media.

There must be government regulations on the number of broadcast outlets a corporation can own so as to stimulate competition within the market. Media broadcasting is not a commodity that can be subject to the free market. Deregulation will only hurt smaller companies by making it more difficult for them to compete with those media conglomerates who will most likely be the winners in the effort to monopolize.

By not placing caps on media ownership a greater number of voices will not be heard. The current situation is dismal enough, which can be witnessed in the ignorance of public awareness with respect to this very issue and in the homogeneity of TV coverage of the Iraq War. A.M. radio is another atrocious example of the way differences in opinion has been stifled as a result of deregulatory legislation passed in 1996.

Diversity of opinion is critical for a democracy to be viable and allowing for competition within media broadcasting market is an extremely important means of obtaining that diversity. If one company is permitted to own more than one broadcasting outlet, surely variety of opinion will diminish.

The airwaves belong to the people. They should not be a commodity which can be bought on the open market. Once more I urge you to respect the right of the people to ownership of the broadcast airwaves by maintaining current legislation regarding caps on ownership of media outlets.

Sincerely,

Richard Cabrera

From: Doris Meyer
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 6:09 PM
Subject: talking points

dear ms abernathy: i am writing in regard to the proposal to relax the rules regarding broadcast company ownership. i strongly urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules now in effect that are meant to protect us in america from manipulation from media monopolies. we need to hear opposing viewpoints and more than one viewpoint on important issues. please continue the broadcast ownership rules that have protected us from the censorship for the past decades. sincerely, james e meyer medford wi 54451

From: Ellen Weiner
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 6:33 PM
Subject: Media Ownership

I saw your interview on Bill Moyer's NOW program and heartily agree with your perspective on this issue. I consider myself fairly well informed, yet have not seen nor read much if any discussion of this topic. I applaud your efforts to bring this to the attention of the public, and hope that you will also make your case via the networks and cable channels. As wonderful as Bill Moyer's NOW program is, I'm afraid the viewership is tiny in comparison to the myraid other sources through which most Americans get their information. Thank you for sounding the alarm. Is there any way to postpone this vote until such time as the American public is fully informed and the topic clearly debated?
E. Weiner

From: Robert Theriot
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 6:36 PM
Subject: Media Monopolies

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. Thank you.

Robert L. Theriot, 33 Texas Ave., Houma, LA 70360, 985-876-5750

From: Rich12332@cs.com
To: Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 6:37 PM
Subject: Media Monopolies Have Muzzled Dissent

http://www.truthout.org/docs_03/050203e.shtml

Media Monopolies Have Muzzled Dissent

By Ian Masters

Los Angeles Times

Thursday 1 May 2003

If information is the oxygen of democracy, the United States has just been gassed, not by weapons of mass destruction but by a weapon of mass distraction.

With George W. Bush basking in glorious ratings and Fox News climbing in the ratings, we may be moving toward a coronation instead of a reelection in 2004. It was, after all, Rupert Murdoch's unilateral anointment of Bush as the winner in the early hours of the morning after the undecided 2000 election that led Al Gore to foolishly concede, because he and the other networks believed what they saw on Fox Television.

Now the marriage between a government and its volunteer information ministry has been consecrated by the blessed victory of "Operation Iraqi Freedom," the geopolitical equivalent of an O.J. meets "Joe Millionaire" wrapped in the flag.

Totalitarian regimes don't tolerate any distinction between journalism and propaganda, but in most democracies it is unprecedented for the free press to abandon Joseph Pulitzer for the methods of Joseph Goebbels.

How did a born-again, family-values administration get in bed with a purveyor of misogyny and mayhem, trash and titillation? The common thread, for all the public piety, has to be the late Lee Atwater, who was friend, mentor and role model to George W., Karl Rove and Roger Ailes, the head hound in the Fox pound of junkyard attack-dog journalism.

This undemocratic confluence of politics and propaganda has long been in the making as corporate media have been incrementally empowered while public influence, input and "interest" have been eliminated.

The transformation of active citizens into passive consumers was enabled by the Federal Communications Commission under Ronald Reagan's Mark Fowler, who declared "the perception of broadcasters as community trustees should be replaced by a view of broadcasters as marketplace participants."

Welcome to America, Mr. Murdoch: You can buy the airwaves and, who knows, some day the presidency. TV's Fox could not get away with its shameless shilling for the White House if the Fairness Doctrine were still in place, and radio's Clear Channel monopoly would not be able to impose wall-to-wall Limbaugh, Hannity and Savage, etc., on the public if broadcasters were accountable to public opinion rather than the dictates of plutocrats.

How could it be that in the land of the free and the home of the brave Americans are afraid of opinions?

Where are the Tom Paines, the Mark Twains, the Menckens, the Ida Tarbells?

Dissent has not gone away; it has just been marginalized by monopolies and relegated to the interstices of the Internet.

But the hammer is about to drop on the Internet too. The head of the FCC, Michael Powell, wants to give away what's left of the store to the broadband cable and satellite providers and make them gatekeepers or tollbooths on the information highway.

It used to be that the Internet was accessed via a common carrier, the phone company, but as technology has moved forward, these new unregulated media monopolies have increasing control over the information pipeline. Without regulation, they have the ability to choose what content they provide.

Two FCC commissioners want to delay this hand-over and encourage public debate, but the public is largely unaware of what is at stake.

Obviously you can't expect the Limbaughs, O'Reillys and their bosses or their president in the White House to give them talking points on preserving diversity of opinion while there is a tax cut to sell.

So speak up, America: It's your country, they're your airwaves. Maybe you can pursue the American dream while you are asleep, but it will be too late to reclaim your country's freedom when you wake up.

Ian Masters is the host of "Background Briefing" on KPFK-FM (90.7) in Los Angeles.

(In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, this material is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes.)

(c) Copyright 2003 by TruthOut.org

Robert L. Theriot, 33 Texas Ave., Houma, LA 70360, 985-876-5750

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. Thank you.

From: Robert Theriot
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 6:37 PM
Subject: Media Monopolies

From: Walter A
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 6:38 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Our newspaper and radio stations are already monopolies in my view. Please do not give these media giants any more rule changes to snuff out what few independent voices we have left.
Thanks for consideration.

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.
<http://search.yahoo.com>

From: Robert Theriot
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 6:39 PM
Subject: Media Monopolies

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. Thank you.

Robert L. Theriot, 33 Texas Ave., Houma, LA 70360, 985-876-5750

From: David Kane
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 6:50 PM
Subject: Monopoly Control of the Media

Dear Mr. Copps,

My wife and I just watched your interview with Bill Moyers on NOW and are quite disturbed with what has happened to the regulation (or de-regulation) of the public airways. There must be some way in which we, the public, can take back control of the airwaves, e.g., reinstituting the "Fairness Doctrine", ensuring that public interest channels are alive and active, etc. What can we do to aid you in your quest to have further hearings on the ill-conceived doctrine of opening up the airwaves to monopoly control?

I am a retired official of the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) (1973-1989) and consequently am always very concerned about the proper allocation of the limited frequency spectrum (and orbit space in the case of satellites). In particular, I am a strong advocate of having TV and radio airtime made available for public debates during significant federal elections, and I think that this objective should be mandatory for the FCC.

Please let us know if there is anything that we can do to help you at this time.

Sincerely,

David Kane
email: damjkane@worldnet.att.net

From: Joe Neff
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 7:01 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Rules

I understand that the longstanding rules with regard to the number of media outlets that can be owned by any one party in a given local market are soon to be loosened or eliminated. How can this happen before the majority of Americans understand why it is in the "public interest"? This very issue has received little or no coverage in the popular national broadcast media or any local media. Too many important issues receive this kind of treatment and we citizens are provided only corporate propaganda. Since We the People are the rightful owners of the airwaves, it only stands to reason that We need a reasonable dialogue that convinces us that any rule change is indeed in the public interest and will not result in increased corporate control of the broadcast media. Should the latter occur it will be a great loss to our democracy.

Joseph Neff
18515 13th AVE NE
Poulsbo, WA 98370
jnneff@earthlink.net

CC: kabernet@fcc.gov, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, jastlde@fcc.gov

From: Rick O'Day
To: mpowel@fcc.gov, Kathleen Abernathy, mcops@fcc.gov, KM KJMWEB, jdelste@fcc.gov
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 7:03 PM
Subject: Postpone the media ownership vote!

Dear Chairman Powel and Commissioners:

I write to make you aware of the concern that I and my family have of rushing the media ownership vote before adequate study of the long-term ramifications are made and understood by all.

As a US citizen, I need to know that the proposal to be voted upon is right for the people of the United States.

We the people are in no rush to have this issue voted upon next month, so please take the time needed to study all sides of this issue and vote in a way that protects us - the citizens who are the owners of the airwaves and communication frequencies.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Richard O'Day
20 Linda Street
Westborough, MA 01581

CC: rickoday@rcn.com

From: CCHenda@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 7:04 PM
Subject: Concerned Citizen

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

A friend told me that the FCC (operates independent of Congress, etc.) is being pressured by major media companies to let them buy out the small media outlets in small towns and cities.

I am Concerned for a couple of reasons:

- If only a few major organizations own all the media outlets, then how is the population to get both sides of an issue? Under the current political situation, I view this as very dangerous surrender of a freedom.

- In time of local emergency, how are the local populations going to be notified? If you are operating, for instance, a radio station with canned programming which usually has no live broadcaster.

I am hoping that the Commissioners at the FCC are going to looking into this issue seriously and will make an educated decision when it comes to voting for or against this issue. I do not support this consolidation by the FCC. I know that the FCC is being pressured by major organizations, but the decision you make on this issue may mean the end of our democracy as we know it today.

It's in your hands. Please do the right thing.

Charles Hendershott

From: CCHenda@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 7:07 PM
Subject: Concerned Citizen

Dear Chairman Powell,

A friend told me that the FCC (operates independent of Congress, etc.) is being pressured by major media companies to let them buy out the small media outlets in small towns and cities.

I am Concerned for a couple of reasons:

- If only a few major organizations own all the media outlets, then how is the population to get both sides of an issue? Under the current political situation, I view this as very dangerous surrender of a freedom.

- In time of local emergency, how are the local populations going to be notified? If you are operating, for instance, a radio station with canned programming which usually has no live broadcaster.

I am hoping that the Commissioners at the FCC are going to looking into this issue seriously and will make an educated decision when it comes to voting for or against this issue. I do not support this consolidation by the FCC. I know that the FCC is being pressured by major organizations, but the decision you make on this issue may mean the end of our democracy as we know it today.

It's in your hands. Please do the right thing.

Charles Hendershott

From: peddoc07@hotmail.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 7:17 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

don shifrin
2700 northup way
bellevue, Washington 98004-1463

cc:
Senator Patty Murray
Representative Jennifer Dunn
Senator Maria Cantwell

From: peddoc07@hotmail.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 7:17 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

don shifrin
2700 northup way
bellevue, Washington 98004-1463

cc:
Senator Patty Murray
Representative Jennifer Dunn
Senator Maria Cantwell

From: beth mmm
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 7:25 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Rule Changes

Currently 3 large corporations control 80 percent of the media audience. They can (and do) refuse to air or print diverse opinions, certain songs/artists, ads that do not accord with their particular biases, and public input. As one company openly stated, "We are not in the business to air well-researched news." In fact, these companies are in business to make money for themselves and their stockholders. It is big business vs. community interests; it is public input vs. the bottom line.

The airwaves belong to the public, and the public needs to have its views expressed and to be made aware of the changes you are about to make. Restricted airways have removed or limited consumer choice, news from far distant locations, and community input. Our airwaves have been taken over by paid advertising in half-hour time slots.

Democracy depends on diversity of ideas and freedom of speech. We do not want to lose access to vital information and the free flow of ideas.

Do NOT weaken or eliminate rules that now control media mergers and acquisitions. Media monopoly will place severe restrictions on our valuable "marketplace of ideas."

Beth Malmgren
10817 W. Amber Trail
Sun City, AZ 85351-1046
623-933-9426
mam36@juno.com

From: William A. Thompson
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 7:27 PM
Subject: DO NOT adopt proposed "broadcast ownership rules"

I would like to urge you not to support the proposed broadcast ownership rules because I feel that they will result in some media not allowing even the purchase of advertisements, the point of view of which they do not endorse.

Thank you.
William A. Thompson

From: Ppuntoj@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 7:28 PM
Subject: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation

Dear Chairman Powell-It is imperative that we put a stop to further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation." The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide fair, unbiased information about the most important issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I urge you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation.
Thank you, Jenny Pschaida.

From: William A. Thompson
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 7:28 PM
Subject: DO NOT adopt proposed "broadcast ownership rules"

I would like to urge you not to support the proposed broadcast ownership rules because I feel that they will result in some media not allowing even the purchase of advertisements, the point of view of which they do not endorse.

Thank you.
William A. Thompson

From: Ppuntonioj@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 7:36 PM
Subject: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation

Dear Commissioner-It is imperative that we put a stop to further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation." The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide fair, unbiased information about the most important issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I urge you to challenge the media conglomerates to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation. Thank you, Jenny Pschaida.

From: Steve Hamilton
To: FCC FCCINFO
cc:
Subject: Media ownership program

To: Federal Communications Commission

It has come to my attention that a vote by the FCC is scheduled in about a month on an important media ownership program; and that there has not been an appropriate process of informing the FCC commission members on the details, much less the general public to whom the airwaves belong.

I urge you to delay the vote until the details of the program are released to the public and a comment period of 6 to 12 months follows the release.

Steve Hamilton
101 Lynnwood Drive
Murray, KY 42071

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.
<http://search.yahoo.com>